

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 30, 2004. Claims 1 to 4 remain pending in the application, with Claims 5 to 9 having been canceled. Claim 1 is the only independent claim herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 5 was objected to for an informality. Without conceding the correctness of the objection, Claim 5 has been cancelled, thereby obviating the objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0178370 (Gurevich). In this regard, the Office, while citing Gurevich, erroneously lists Kramer (from previous Office Action) and being the relied upon reference in the Detailed Action. Nonetheless, without conceding the correctness of the rejections of Claim 5 to 9, those claims have nonetheless been cancelled, thereby obviating the rejections thereof. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns allowing a user to install software. According to the invention, a user obtains a first installation key by notifying a sales company of ID information which forwards the ID information to an authorizing agency. The authorizing agency confirms the legitimacy of the user and the sales company then produces and issues a first installation key to the user. The user is then allowed to input the first installation key and the ID information into an installer, whereby the installer produces a second installation key from the input ID information and compares the first and second installation keys. If the keys are found to correspond to one another, then the software is installed by the installer.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is a method of allowing a user to install software on a computer, comprising the steps of notifying a sales company of ID information of the user, communicating the notified ID information of the user from the sales company to an authorizing agency to request a confirmation of legitimacy of the user having notified the ID information, confirming the legitimacy of the user in the authorizing agency in accordance with the notified ID information to communicate a result of the confirmation to the sales company, producing, in the sales company, a first installation key uniquely corresponding to the user on the basis of the ID information, and issuing the first installation key to the user if the user is confirmed to be a legitimate user, allowing the user to input the first installation key and the ID information to an installer, producing, by the installer, a second installation key from the input ID information to obtain a comparison result by comparing the input first installation key with the produced second installation key, and installing the software by the installer if the first installation key corresponds to the second installation key in the comparison result.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the present invention, and in particular is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a sales company issuing a first installation key to a user if the user is confirmed to be a legitimate user, allowing the user to input the first installation key and ID information into an installer, and the installer producing a second installation key from the input ID information, comparing the first and second installation keys, and installing software if the first and second keys correspond.

Initially, Applicant notes that Gurevich's effective U.S. filing date (as listed on the publication) of December 29, 2000 is subsequent to Applicant's foreign priority date

of July 27, 2000 under 35 U.S.C. § 119. Accordingly, Gurevich could be removed as a reference by filing a sworn translation of the priority document, so long as each pending claim is fully supported by that document. However, since the Examiner has not yet acknowledged Applicant's claim to priority under § 119, and since the claims are nonetheless believed to be allowable over Gurevich, Applicant has decided not to submit a sworn translation at this time. Nonetheless, Applicant again requests that the Examiner acknowledge Applicant's claim to priority under § 119 in the next communication.

Gurevich is merely seen to disclose that a password management utility program (PMU) is stored in a token, the token is recognized by a personal identification number (PIN) stored in the token or provided from a subscriber, and a password is generated by very long stream of bytes (VLSB) stored in the token. However, Gurevich is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a sales company issuing a first installation key to a user if the user is confirmed to be a legitimate user, allowing the user to input the first installation key and ID information into an installer, and the installer producing a second installation key from the input ID information, comparing the first and second installation keys, and installing software if the first and second keys correspond.

Thus, Claims 1 to 4 are not believed to be anticipated by Gurevich.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Edward A. Kmett
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 88188v1